proceedings owing to the difficulty of ascertaining the encumbrances on the property, or his inability to have the notice served on the judgment-debtor (Sec. 38, clause 482) or other similar causes. Very often the decree-holder grants time to the judgment-debtor for payment of the amount decreed by the court. If in such cases the attachment is to cease, the judgment-debtor will be enabled to alienate the property and place it beyond the reach of the decree-holder.

*Reply of Government.*—Will be referred to the Rules Committee.

SUBJECT No. 14.

Amendment of Rule 3, Schedule (1), Order XXXII, of the Civil Procedure Code.

Mr. S. Seetharamiah, Shimoga taluk.

*Summary of discussion.*—This Rule makes it obligatory that a notice should be served on the minor defendant before an order is passed for the appointment of a guardian. As this procedure is opposed to judicial principles, the Rule may be amended.

This was considered along with subject No. 15.

SUBJECT No. 15.

Amendment of the Civil Procedure Code *re* issue of notices to minors.

Mr. Guru Rao, Mysore District Board.

*Summary of discussion.*—The Civil Procedure Code requires the issue of notice to minors when they are parties in a suit. This being of no use, it is prayed that this rule may either be amended or so modified as to bring minors of above ten years within its operation.

*Reply of Government.*—The question has been referred to the Rules Committee. Let us await the receipt of the recommendation of that body.

SUBJECT No. 16.

Amendment of Municipal Regulation.

Messrs. M. C. Rangiengar, M Venkatakrishniah Amble Anniah Pandit and Banumiah, Mysore City Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—It is prayed that the Municipal Regulation be amended as a whole.

*Reply of Government.*—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Amendment of Section 164 of Municipal Regulation.

Messrs. K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality, U. S. Siva Rao, and S. Manjiah, Chikmagalur Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—Municipal Councils have no power at present to proceed against immovable property for the recovery of mohatarfa arrears on vacant building sites, etc., and have only to file suits in civil courts for the purpose. As this tedious procedure causes unnecessary expenditure and delay in the recovery of arrears, Section 164 of the Municipal Regulation may be so amended as to enable the Councils to exercise this power independently of the said courts.

Messrs. V. Raghavachar, K. Ramanujiengar, H. Krishnappa and Karnik Krishnamurti Rao opposed the suggestion on the ground that, as the orders of the Municipal Councils would be final they should not be given the power of recovering arrears due on vacant building sites independently of the civil courts. Messrs. Anniah Pandit and Usman Khan supported the prayer and remarked that